


ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL
Fifty-second Session
OFFICIAL RECORDS
*Friday, 7 January 1972,
at 4 p.m.*
NEW YORK

President: Mr. Károly SZARKA (Hungary).

AGENDA ITEM 7
Elections (*concluded*) (E/L.1472, E/L.1473)
ELECTION OF 27 ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF THE SESSIONAL COMMITTEES OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (E/L.1473)

1. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that, for his delegation, the fact that it was participating in the election of the 27 additional members of the sessional committees in no way prejudged the position which the French Government might take on the enlargement of the Economic and Social Council itself. Nor, in his delegation's view, could it constitute a precedent with regard to the total number of seats on the sessional committees and their distribution among the various geographical regions.

2. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) announced that the six candidates put forward by the group of Western European and other States were Austria, Canada, Denmark, Netherlands, Spain and Sweden. The fact that the United Kingdom delegation was introducing the list of candidates should in no way be interpreted as signifying a change in the position which it had taken in the General Assembly where it had opposed the enlargement of the Economic and Social Council and any change in the distribution of seats on the sessional committees.

3. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) said he was pleased to see that the Council was becoming more democratic and pointed out that his delegation had always favoured an increase in its membership. He also hoped that efforts would be made to make the distribution of seats more equitable.

4. Mr. AN (China) announced that the Chinese delegation was in favour of enlarging the Economic and Social Council to increase the number of members from 27 to 54. Not only was such a step necessary in view of the increase in the membership of the United Nations, but it would also enable the Council to discharge its functions more effectively.

5. The distribution of seats among the various regional groups did not, however, seem reasonable as it did not reflect the actual situation. The 32 Asian States in the United Nations were only given 11 seats in the Council, which represented one third of their number; the Western European and other States, 23 Members of the United

Nations, had 13 seats, which represented 50 per cent; the socialist States of Eastern Europe, 7 Members of the United Nations, were entitled to 6 seats, which represented 85 per cent. The imbalance was thus striking, particularly with regard to the socialist States of Eastern Europe. Furthermore, the USSR and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic each had a seat in that group, which in fact meant that the USSR had two seats for itself. That inequitable situation should therefore be remedied.

6. His delegation was also opposed to India's candidacy for the sessional committees of the Council. It was a well-known fact that that country had launched a barbarous attack against Pakistan, thereby dismembering a sovereign State. The Indian Government had flagrantly violated General Assembly resolution 2793 (XXVI) concerning a cease-fire and the withdrawal of troops and had refused to implement Security Council resolution 307 (1971) concerning those matters. A country which thus flouted the principles of the Charter should not be authorized to take part in the work of the sessional committees of the Council. Furthermore, India had occupied a seat in the Economic and Social Council for 16 years; there was therefore no reason why it should again submit its candidacy and thus exclude other countries which also wanted to participate in the work of the Council. For all such reasons, his delegation was firmly opposed to India's candidacy for the sessional committees of the Council.

7. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary) pointed out to the representative of China that the seats were distributed in accordance with criteria established by the General Assembly in resolution 2847 (XXVI), paragraph 4.

8. Mr. AN also appeared to have made a mistake in his calculations: there were 10 socialist States of Eastern Europe which were Members of the United Nations and not 7.

9. Mr. KUŁAGA (Poland) supported the remarks of the representative of Hungary concerning the number of Socialist States of Eastern Europe which were Members of the United Nations. He saw no need to argue with the statement made by the Chinese representative which, since it was based on errors in its fundamental arithmetic, was evidently wrong in its entirety. As to the question of election, he had the impression that elections were held by secret ballot; but since one delegation had stated its position, his delegation would do likewise and indicate that it would vote for India.

10. Without entering into the substance of the question, since he had explained at length Poland's attitude in the

Security Council, he wished merely to point out that the outcome of events on the Indian subcontinent had proved that the position adopted by the Polish delegation in the Security Council had been justified.

11. Mr. JAIN (Observer for India), speaking in accordance with rule 75 of the rules of procedure, also recalled that elections of the kind which the Council was about to hold were normally held by secret ballot. That was why he was surprised to see one delegation take the initiative of indicating how it was going to vote. In doing so, that delegation had once again made allegations which were not only devoid of any foundation but also tended deliberately to ignore reality. As the representative of Poland had said, that serious problem had already been discussed thoroughly in the Security Council and events had shown that the position adopted by India had been the right one.

12. In any case, it was neither the time nor the place to deal with that question and his delegation did not wish to dwell on the reasons why a matter unrelated to the agenda item under consideration had been raised. Such accusations had become the rule and, for its part, his delegation intended to treat them with its usual indifference.

13. Although all the Asian countries had welcomed the enlargement of the Council, they had good reason to believe that they were not being granted the number of seats which were due to them in the sessional committees in accordance with the principle of equitable geographical distribution. It was therefore surprising to see an Asian country opposed to having Asia fully represented within its limited entitlement. He did, however, hope that his country would nevertheless have an opportunity to continue to make an active contribution to the work of the Council, as it had always done in the past.

14. With regard to the fact that India had sat on the Council for several years, he said that it should be remembered, first, that it was not the only country in that situation and, furthermore, that its candidacy was unreservedly supported by the Asian group.

15. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that the election of the 27 additional members of the sessional committees was a prelude to the enlargement of the Council itself, which his delegation had always actively supported.

16. He appealed to those Governments which had not yet joined the majority on that matter to re-examine their position and arrange to ratify the decision taken by the General Assembly in resolution 2847 (XXVI) as quickly as possible. Furthermore, he said that the Council should simply proceed to the elections and not have a substantive debate on the question of the distribution of seats. Lastly, the elections should be held by secret ballot, in accordance with rule 72 of the rules of procedure, which would relieve delegations of having to indicate their position and explain their vote.

17. Mr. AKRAM (Observer for Pakistan), speaking in accordance with rule 75 of the rules of procedure,

thanked the representative of China for the position of principle which he had taken in opposing India's candidacy.

18. In that regard, he said that Pakistan itself had opposed India's candidacy within the Asian group and it was therefore not correct to say that it had been unreservedly supported.

19. The participation of a Member State in the work of any organ of the United Nations was predicated on respect for the principles governing such organs. It was, however, known that India had violated the principles of the Charter by being guilty of aggression, a fact which could not be denied. That was why those States which upheld the principles of the Charter were perfectly entitled to oppose India's participation in the work of the sessional committees.

20. Mr. GETMANETS (Observer for the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking in accordance with rule 75 of the rules of procedure, said he wished to refute categorically the remarks of the representative of China concerning the participation of his country in the Council. The Ukrainian SSR was a founding Member of the United Nations and had always taken an active part in its work. In particular, it had taken the initiative in opening discussions on many questions with a view to creating more favourable conditions for the economic independence of new developing Member States; moreover, it had struggled for 25 years for the restoration of China's rights in the United Nations.

21. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia), speaking on a point of order, pointed out that the Council was concerned with elections, not with political problems. He therefore proposed that it should proceed to the vote immediately.

22. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said he regretted that the representative of China had raised a series of questions which had no bearing on the agenda item. His statement confirmed what it had already been possible to observe on other occasions, namely, that the representatives of the People's Republic of China had come to the United Nations to sow discord among Member States and among the various regional groups. That was indeed the only possible interpretation of the Chinese representative's statement.

23. Seats in the sessional committees were distributed in accordance with criteria established by the General Assembly in resolution 2847 (XXVI). The socialist countries — which, as the Hungarian representative had quite correctly pointed out, numbered 10 and not 7 — had always taken an active part in the work of the Council and its subsidiary bodies. That was particularly true for the Ukrainian SSR, a full Member of the United Nations which had acquired that status through the loss of millions of victims in the struggle against fascism during the Second World War. He therefore vehemently rejected any attempt to undermine the unity of the group of socialist States or to infringe on the rights of any one of those States.

24. It was unfortunate that the representative of China had used his statement on the elections for the purpose of slandering India and the Soviet Union yet again. He did not wish to reopen a debate on the substance of the India-Pakistan problem, as his delegation had had an opportunity to state its position on the matter in the Security Council. However, he wished to point out that subsequent developments in the region and, in particular, the admission by the new régime of the errors committed by the régime of Yahya Kahn in East Pakistan, had justified the Soviet position. It had been the refusal of the Pakistan authorities to accept a political settlement in East Pakistan that had caused the tension and hostilities. During the consideration of the question in the Security Council, China, in collusion with the United States of America, had attempted to prevent the adoption of a decision which would have put an end to the conflict. In so doing, it had betrayed the liberation movements and had struck a bargain with the forces of reaction. Now it was opposing the election of India on false pretext that India had committed aggression, while closing its eyes to the real acts of aggression being committed by the United States in Viet-Nam. It did not protest against the participation of the United States in the work of the Council, nor against that of other countries which were involved in that war; on the contrary, the representative of China had congratulated the representative of one of those countries on his election to a high office in the Council.

25. In conclusion, he hoped that the representatives of China would in future endeavour to assist the Council in its work by striving for international co-operation in the field of economic development, and not complicate matters by sowing discord among its members.

26. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) requested members to wait until the elections had been completed before stating views which he considered irrelevant.

27. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana), speaking on a point of order, requested the closure of the debate on the item, in accordance with rule 53 of the rules of procedure, so that the Council could proceed to the vote.

28. The PRESIDENT suggested that Pakistan, China and India, which had asked to speak, should not do so until after the elections had been completed.

29. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that the representative of Ghana was correct in calling for the closure of a debate which more appropriately belonged in the Security Council. However, if the countries mentioned were to be granted their right of reply, that should be done immediately so that their statements could have their full impact.

30. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that he disagreed entirely with the representative of Greece.

31. Mr. FIGUEROA (Chile) said he feared that there now might not be enough time for the elections; he therefore proposed that the Council should hear the three countries which would in any case have to speak.

32. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) said that if the Greek proposal was followed, the Council would have to hear all the speakers who wished to exercise their right of reply. It would therefore be preferable to close the debate.

The motion for closure of the debate was adopted by 19 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions.

33. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote because it considered that no debate had been in progress.

34. Mr. FIGUEROA (Chile) reserved his right to explain his vote after the elections.

35. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) said that the following seven candidates were being submitted by the African group: Botswana, Cameroon, Congo, Egypt, Rwanda, Senegal, Sudan.

36. Miss LIM (Malaysia) said that the following six candidates were being submitted by the Asian group: India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Philippines, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Yemen.

37. Mr. KULAGA (Poland) said that the following three candidates were being submitted by the group of socialist States of Eastern Europe: Bulgaria, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Náthón (Hungary) and Mr. Gates (New Zealand) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	27
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	27
<i>Abstentions:</i>	0
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	27
<i>Required majority:</i>	14

<i>Number of votes obtained:</i>	
Argentina	27
Denmark	27
Egypt	27
Mexico	27
Romania	27
Rwanda	27
Trinidad and Tobago	27
Austria	26
Botswana	26
Bulgaria	26
Canada	26
Congo	26
Indonesia	26
Senegal	26
Sudan	26
Sweden	26
Venezuela	26
Cameroon	25
Netherlands	25
Pakistan	25
Philippines	25

Number of votes obtained (concluded):

Spain	25
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	25
Yemen	25
People's Democratic Republic of Yemen	24
India	22
Barbados	21

Having obtained the required majority, the aforementioned countries were elected additional members of the sessional committees of the Council.

ELECTION OF THE 13 MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

38. The PRESIDENT recalled that the members of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations were elected for one year, unless they ceased to be members of the Council, and were chosen from among the States members of the Council in 1972.

39. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) read out the list of candidates, which had been drawn up in accordance with the principle of geographical representation:

African and Asian States: Ghana, Kenya, Tunisia, Japan, Malaysia;

Latin American States: Bolivia, Peru;

Western European and other States: France, Greece, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

Socialist States of Eastern Europe: Hungary, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The 13 aforementioned candidates were elected by acclamation.

ELECTION OF 10 MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND (E/L.1472)

40. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) said that, although there was no question of the representation of the regional groups in the election under consideration, he wished, on behalf of the Western States which were not represented in the Council, to submit the following list of candidates: Belgium, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

41. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) suggested that, if there was no objection, candidates from groups other than the group of Western States should be regarded as having been elected by acclamation. A vote should be taken only in the case of the latter group, which had more candidates than there were vacancies.

42. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) recalled that General Assembly resolution 1038 (XI) of 7 December 1956 had not established a precise formula for geographical distribution. It was therefore impossible to vote on any specific group.

43. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) informed the Council that the candidates from the African Group were Congo and Nigeria.

44. Miss LIM (Malaysia) said that the following two candidates were being put forward by the Asian Group: Indonesia and Philippines.

45. Mr. KULAGA (Poland) said that the following candidate was being put forward by the Group of socialist States of Eastern Europe: Bulgaria.

46. Mr. SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil) said that the following candidate was being put forward by the Group of Latin American States: Chile.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Náthón (Hungary) and Mr. Gates (New Zealand) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	27
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	27
<i>Abstentions:</i>	0
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	27
<i>Required majority:</i>	14

Number of votes obtained:

Indonesia	27
Nigeria	27
Switzerland	27
Chile	26
Philippines	25
Congo	24
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	23
Bulgaria	22
Sweden	22
Turkey	21

Having obtained the required majority, the 10 aforementioned candidates were elected members of the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund.

ELECTION OF ONE MEMBER OF THE STATISTICAL COMMISSION

47. The PRESIDENT recalled that the election of one member of the Statistical Commission, to be chosen from among the Latin American States, had been postponed at the Council's resumed fifty-first session. He announced that Argentina was a candidate for the seat.

Argentina was elected a member of the Statistical Commission by acclamation.

ELECTION OF FIVE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

48. The PRESIDENT recalled that at its resumed fifty-first session the Council had deferred the election of five members of the Committee on Natural Resources until the organizational meetings of the fifty-second session.

49. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) read out the list of candidates, drawn up on the basis of geographical distribution:

African States: Nigeria
 Latin American States: Colombia
 Asian States: no candidate
 Western European and other States: no candidate.

50. Miss LIM (Malaysia) informed the Council that the Asian Group reserved the right to present a candidate as soon as possible.

Colombia and Nigeria were elected members of the Committee on Natural Resources by acclamation.

51. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, since no candidates had been put forward by the Asian Group and the Group of Western European and other States, a brief meeting of the Council should be convened to fill the remaining seats as soon as the Chairmen of the two Groups were in a position to put forward a sufficient number of candidates.

It was so decided.

52. The PRESIDENT reminded members of the Council that at the 1808th meeting, on 20 December 1971, 11 members had been elected to the Committee on Natural Resources, namely, Ceylon, Costa Rica, Greece, Hungary, Kuwait, Malaysia, Sudan, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Zaire. The Council would now proceed to draw lots to determine the term of office of the 11 members elected in December and the two members just elected.

Having been drawn by lot by the President, Ceylon, Greece, Hungary, Kuwait, Sudan, Trinidad and Tobago and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic were appointed for a three-year term and Colombia, Costa Rica, Malaysia, Nigeria, Uganda and Zaire were appointed for a one-year term.

53. Mr. AN (China), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said he wished to express his delegation's views on the statements made by some delegations, in particular the USSR delegation. The first point concerned the armed aggression waged by India against Pakistan. All the delegations which had recently participated in United Nations proceedings had been in a position to observe that India had pursued its policy of expansion with the connivance of Soviet imperialism. The Treaty of Friendship between India and the Soviet Union was actually a military alliance, which had enabled India, within a very short period of time, to mount a barbaric and bloody war of aggression and to occupy East Pakistan. The world had not witnessed so flagrant an act of aggression since the actions of the German fascists during the Second World War. The question had been debated in the Security Council and most Member States had upheld the cause of justice and had been against the aggression. It was solely because the Soviet Union had systematically exercised the right of veto that no decision

could be adopted by the Security Council. With the Security Council paralysed, the General Assembly had adopted, by an overwhelming majority of 104 votes, a resolution on the side of justice, but it had not deterred the Soviet Union and India from pursuing their evil purposes. The Soviet socialist-imperialists' hands were smeared with the blood of countless martyrs, which could not be washed away. They should not rejoice too soon, however, for the tide was already turning.

54. Moreover the Soviet delegation had referred to the struggle of the Viet-Nameese people. That question was not before the United Nations, but the Chinese people had very clearly stated its views on it, and the seven hundred million Chinese vigorously supported the Viet-Nameese people. As long as they continued their heroic struggle, China would continue to spare no sacrifice until final victory over the United States aggressor. That position could not be denied by the Soviet socialist-imperialists, for it was clear to the whole world.

55. The Soviet delegation had also argued that the Chinese delegation wished to sow dissension in the United Nations, but the truth was that the Soviet socialist-imperialists themselves were guilty of that act. One had only to recall the position taken by the Soviet Union when, in defiance of the wishes of the majority, it had vetoed all the resolutions of the Security Council solely in order to support Indian expansionism. Was that a sign of respect for the principles set forth in the Charter? In reality, the Members of the United Nations could unite only by defending those principles and by defending truth, and to the extent that they supported aggression, they acted wrongly. Many other examples could be given which showed clearly that the Soviet Union was everywhere following a policy of aggression and interference in the internal affairs of other States. Through their big-power chauvinism the Soviet leaders had betrayed Marxist-Leninist doctrine and the Chinese people were convinced that the masses of people in the world shared that opinion. It was important to recall that China's lawful rights in the United Nations had only just been restored, and China was deeply grateful to many countries who had given it their support. China's contribution to the work of the United Nations was still very limited, but China had immediately made it clear that it would work most determinedly against domination of the United Nations by one or two super-Powers. China would stand beside the third world and the small and medium-sized countries of the world on the side of justice.

56. With regard to the election of the Ukrainian SSR to the sessional committees of the Council, it should be recalled that many countries of Latin America, Africa and Asia were eager to participate in the Council's work, and his delegation could not see by what right the Soviet Union, which was a single country, held two seats.

57. All the countries of the world were following every move of the Soviet Government, but every move of the Soviet Government in the world so far had cast dishonour on that country and had betrayed the aspirations of the peoples of the world and the Marxist-Leninist doctrine.

58. Mr. JAIN (Observer for India), speaking in accordance with rule 75 of the rules of procedure, said it was very unfortunate that so many extraneous elements had been introduced under the item on elections. Long hours had been devoted to questions which bore no relation to those before the Council. Since those questions had been raised, however, he wished to observe that Pakistan had been the first to commit acts of aggression. Pakistan, by practising a policy of genocide against the people of Bangladesh, had created an indelible blot on the history of mankind. It was paradoxical to hear the representatives of Pakistan speak of respect for the purposes and principles of the Charter when Pakistan had forced millions of people to flee their homes, trampled all human rights under foot and violated the instruments of international law to which they were party. That being so, to hear Pakistan's representatives say that India did not respect the Charter would be laughable if the circumstances were not so tragic. The proverb "people who live in glass houses shouldn't throw stones" immediately came to mind.

59. In any case, his delegation believed that the Economic and Social Council, at a time when it was entering a new phase as a result of the enlargement of its membership, should be expected to accomplish serious work instead of denouncing countries which were not represented and could not reply fully to attacks against them.

60. Mr. AKRAM (Observer for Pakistan), speaking in accordance with rule 75 of the rules of procedure, said that his delegation understood the concern shown by the representative of India, who seemed to realize that words of truth had been spoken in the Council. As the representative of China had said, the acts of aggression committed by India explained why that country was discredited in the eyes of the whole world.

61. His delegation wished to set the record straight with regard to certain questions raised by the representative of the Soviet Union. It did so with some regret, since Pakistan had tried in the past to maintain the friendliest relations with the Soviet Union and would continue to make efforts in that direction. However, the Soviet representative's remark to the effect that his country's attitude had been justified by events was unacceptable. If military victory was the only justification for a country's attitude, the statement of the Soviet representative was well founded, but if the main consideration was observance of the Charter and the principle of respect for the territorial integrity of States were observed, it was not. The representative of the Soviet Union had accused Pakistan of short-sightedness and a lack of a sense of reality. The same reasoning could be applied to the Soviet Union's refusal to recognize that it was India that had attacked Pakistan, not the reverse. It was clear to everyone that it was India that had launched a full-scale war for the sole purpose of dismembering Pakistan. Whatever mistakes had been committed by the Government of General Yahya Khan, nothing could justify the use of force by one State to dismember another State, an act which was a violation of all the principles in international law. His delegation hoped that that fact would be recognized one day by those who now refused to

recognize it. The members of the Council had not forgotten that the Soviet veto in the Security Council had prevented the adoption of resolutions which would have ended the conflict and started a withdrawal of troops on both sides of the frontier. Nor could the Council forget that the Soviet Union had opposed a resolution which had been adopted by the General Assembly by the overwhelming majority of 104 Members. Nevertheless, his delegation continued to nurture the sincere hope that the Soviet Union would correct its present errors and adopt a position more in keeping with moral realities and respect for the fundamental principles of the Charter, including the principle that the territory of sovereign States could not be occupied by force and that countries could not be dismembered by the use of arms and military power. The Soviet Union had supported those principles in the past and it was to be hoped that it would act in accordance with those principles in the future. If the Soviet Union was genuinely concerned, as it said it was, about the "lawful rights" of the people of East Pakistan, its leaders should prevail upon India, its ally, to withdraw its troops and enable the people to express their true wishes.

62. Mr. GETMANETS (Observer for the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking under rule 75 of the rules of procedure, thanked the members of the Council for electing the Ukrainian SSR to the three sessional committees and wished to assure them that his delegation would do everything in its power to make a useful contribution to the work of those bodies.

63. The thesis advanced by the Chinese delegation was not a new one. In the plenary meetings of the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly the same thesis had been advanced by a representative of an imperialist Power. It was therefore astonishing that the Chinese representatives found it so easy to revert to hackneyed old arguments which had already been used in the General Assembly by the representative of an imperialist country. As far as the accusations against the USSR were concerned, alleging aggressive acts against the people of Bangladesh, it sufficed to say that China, which had supported the bloody Pakistan executioners, obviously delighted in shifting the blame from the guilty to the innocent.

64. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the remarks of the representative of China were nothing but a flood of insults and flagrant calumnies directed against the Soviet leaders and the representatives of the Soviet Union to the United Nations. His delegation had participated in the work of the United Nations for many years but had never before had to listen to such outrageous statements, the only purpose of which was to blacken and misrepresent the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and to whitewash the reckless foreign policy which the clique of Chinese leaders was now following. It could not be denied that since the entry of the People's Republic of China into the United Nations its representatives had been seeking by every means at their command to incite anti-Soviet hysteria in that forum, as they had been doing for years in their own country. It was quite obvious that the questions which the

Economic and Social Council was dealing with were of no interest to China and that the latter only wanted to engage in attacks against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. However, the Chinese leaders should realize that such a policy was not popular and would not receive the support of the majority of Member States. It was a policy designed to obstruct and disorganize the work of the Council and the latter would not let itself be distracted from the fulfilment of the tasks entrusted to it. Moreover, China claimed to be the protector of the countries of the third world, but the policy it was pursuing at the United Nations jeopardized the interests of the developing countries above all, since that policy was contrary to the peace, co-operation and equality of rights among all the Member States which had so far been the rule at the United Nations. As to the theme of the struggle against the predominance of one or two super-Powers, if the representatives of China had had more experience of the work of the United Nations they would know that such a situation did not exist and that in the United Nations the representatives of the developing countries expressed themselves freely, that no one threatened their interests, that they had been co-operating with the socialist countries for more than 20 years and that that co-operation had resulted in the adoption of extremely important decisions which constituted the very basis of the economic achievements of the United Nations, such as the establishment of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. That co-operation had only grown stronger with the years, and no one should be allowed to sow discord between those countries.

65. In its statement, the Chinese delegation had once again raised the question of the Soviet position in the conflict between India and Pakistan, even though the Economic and Social Council was not the proper forum for a substantive discussion of that issue. But since the Chinese delegation persisted in trying to bring it up, his delegation wished in turn to make a number of comments. First, China could not escape its own responsibility in that conflict by shifting the blame to the innocent. A brief summary of the India-Pakistan conflict was all that was needed to establish that responsibility. In December 1970, in the first elections which had taken place in East Pakistan, the Awami League had won an overwhelming parliamentary victory, receiving 298 seats out of 329. The people of East Pakistan had thus pronounced themselves unequivocally in favour of the programme of that party, which called for a certain degree of autonomy and a democratic foreign policy. It should be remembered that the programme of the Awami League had not included independence for East Pakistan and that independence had been demanded by the masses precisely in reaction to the atrocities committed by the Pakistan Government, which had trampled on the most elementary of the people's lawful rights. While the Pakistan army had engaged in reprisal operations against the peaceful population, burning villages and shooting innocent people, the Chinese leaders had remained silent and had thus encouraged the bloodshed. China was hardly entitled to invoke the principle of non-interference in the domestic affairs of other States when the sole aim of its own policies was to incite hatred and war between peoples. The Chinese leaders had long been following a policy

hostile to India in order to facilitate China's access to the countries of the third world. Peking had therefore done everything it could to prevent a reconciliation between India and Pakistan. By contrast, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, as all Members of the United Nations were well aware, had insisted from the beginning of the conflict that urgent steps should be taken to put an end to the fighting, but the representatives of China and the United States had prevented the Security Council from adopting the resolutions which the situation called for and which would have made possible the earlier cessation of hostilities. A surprising display of solidarity between the representatives of China and those of the United States had been witnessed by everyone at that time.

66. One could only wonder what the real policy of the Chinese delegation to the United Nations would be in the future. That question had been asked during a plenary meeting in the closing days of the General Assembly on 24 December 1971, and at present the development of the situation tended to indicate that it was a policy of flagrant anti-Sovietism and systematic intimidation. The Soviet Union would not, however, let itself be intimidated by such threats. It was a country which had won immense prestige in the world through its policy of peace and its defence of the interests of the countries which were struggling for their liberation, at both the political and the economic levels, from the yoke of foreign capital. The Chinese leaders had yet to merit such prestige. When the Chinese delegation had stated, in speaking of the India-Pakistan conflict, that the world had not witnessed such bloodshed since the days of Hitler, it seemed to be forgetting the war of aggression which had been in progress for several years in Viet-Nam. The words spoken by the Chinese delegation with regard to that question would deceive no one; everyone knew that the Chinese leaders' own chauvinistic interests were dearer to them than the interests of the Viet-Nameese people.

67. The Soviet Union and the socialist countries had struggled for 20 years for the restoration of the lawful rights of China in the United Nations and that struggle had finally come to a successful conclusion on 25 October 1971. The Chinese leaders should therefore not forget that it was thanks to the Soviet Union above all that their country had been able to enter the United Nations, and it might have been hoped that, in doing so, they would embark upon the path of co-operation with other countries, in a spirit of mutual respect for the interests of each. The United Nations was now faced with many problems which had not yet been resolved and it needed to be strengthened. It was therefore essential that all Member States should unite their efforts and avoid using the Organization for partisan purposes or to further a policy of domination.

68. In conclusion, it was to be hoped that the representatives of China would finally recover their sense of reality and would truly co-operate with the other delegations with a view to maintaining peace and security

in the world, achieving nuclear disarmament, promoting friendship among peoples and establishing broad economic, social and scientific co-operation among all countries. The sooner China understood the need to work

in that direction, the better it would be, both for the United Nations and for China itself.

The meeting rose at 7.55 p.m.